

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number: 16104-005001
	Application Number 10/675,208	Filed September 30, 2003
	First Named Inventor Udo Klein et al	
	Art Unit 2174	Examiner Chris A. Watt

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a Notice of Appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

- ☐ applicant/inventor.
- ☐ assignee of record of the entire interest.
See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b)
is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)
- ☒ attorney or agent of record 54,777
(Reg. No.)
- ☐ attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34

Barbara A Benoit

Signature

Barbara A. Benoit

Typed or printed name

(202) 783-5070

Telephone number

August 2, 2007

Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below.

☒ Total of 5 pages in addition to this form and the Notice of Appeal are submitted.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant	: Udo Klein et al	Art Unit	: 2174
Serial No.	: 10/675,208	Examiner	: Chris A. Watt
Filed	: September 30, 2003	Conf. No.	: 9931
Title	: VARIABLE SIZE INPUT AREAS IN USER INTERFACES		

MAIL STOP AF

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Pursuant to United States Patent and Trademark Office OG Notices: 12 July 2005 - New Pre-Appeal Brief Conference Pilot Program, a request for a review of identified matters on appeal is hereby submitted with the Notice of Appeal. Review of these identified matters by a panel of examiners is requested because the rejections of record are clearly not proper and are without basis, in view of a clear legal or factual deficiency in the rejections. All rights to address additional matters on appeal in any subsequent appeal brief are hereby reserved.

Claims 1-20 have been rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,230,062 (Inaki) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,450,538 (Glaser) and U.S. Patent No. 6,055,550 (Wallack). These rejections were maintained in the advisory action mailed July 6, 2007. Applicant requests withdrawal of these rejections and specifically asks the panel to review the following issue: neither Inaki, Glaser, Wallack nor any proper combination of the three references, describes or suggests the subject matter recited by the independent claims.

Independent claims 1 and 13 recite displaying a user input area within a computer user interface. More particularly, claims 1 and 13 recite displaying the user input area that corresponds to a data field having a specified number of characters. The user input area has a size that visually indicates to a user that the user input area will accommodate therein visual representations of the specified number of characters. Upon receipt of a user input specifying a character to be included in the data field, displaying within the user input area a visual representation of the input character in a proportional font. The size of the user input area is adjusted based on a size of characters included in the data field and the specified number of characters of the data field, where the size of characters included in the data field includes a size

of the input character. The adjusted user input area is displayed where the adjusted user input area has a new size that visually indicates to the user that the user input area will accommodate therein visual representations of a remaining number of the specified number of characters of the data field.

The advisory action indicates that the final action is to be understood to acknowledge that Inaki does not disclose visual indication of “adjusting the size of the field based on the size of characters included in the data field.” The advisory action also indicates that Glaser “is cited to establish a visual indication that can be resized based on the amount of content with a data field in a visual context, which allows the user to view the content without the need to scroll.” The advisory action concedes that “the visual field [in Glaser] does not adjust based on the content of the field.” The advisory action indicates that Wallack is used to “overcome this discrepancy” and, in combination with Inaki and Glaser, discloses “resiz[ing] the field automatically.”

Even assuming for the sake of argument only that the action's characterization of the references is correct and that a proper combination of Inaki, Glaser and Wallack discloses resizing the field automatically, neither Inaki, Glaser, Wallack nor any proper combination of the three references, describes or suggests the subject matter recited by the independent claims. For example, claims 1 and 13 require upon receipt of a user input specifying a character to be included in the data field, displaying within the user input area a visual representation of the input character in a proportional font and that the size of the user input area is adjusted based on a size of characters included in the data field and the specified number of characters of the data field, where the size of characters included in the data field includes a size of the input character.

In contrast, Wallack discloses a system that “resizes selected groups of cells to optimize viewing of data on a computer displayed form.” Wallack at col. 3, lines 11-13. In a particular embodiment, Wallack discloses:

the selected group of cells are aligned in a column on a form that includes rows and columns to form a matrix. The form is populated with data from records that may be stored at remote data sources. To auto size a selected group of cells, a sampling of records that display data in the selected group of cells are identified. For each record selected, a display size is calculated based on the corresponding data. A display size is a size that is [sic] large enough to display, without obstruction, data from a record in the corresponding cell. From all of the display sizes calculated, a single optimal size for each cell in the group of cells is

determined. Based on the optimal size, the group of cells are resized, and additional cells, which are visible on the computer generated form, are also resized or moved to reflect the resizing of the selected group of cells.

Wallack at col. 3, lines 14-29. As such, Wallack discloses auto resizing of selected groups of cells to optimize viewing of data on the computer generated form. See also Wallack at col. 3, lines 11-13.

Wallack discloses a flow diagram illustrating an embodiment for auto sizing of fields on a computer generated form based on sample records in FIG. 2. See Wallack at col. 3, lines 31-35 (describing adjusting the width of columns for one or more selected rows while maintaining a constant height for the row). To do so, Wallack's system first queries the user for the column to be adjusted and sampling information, which may include the number of records to sample, or specific records, such as records currently displayed on the output display. See Wallack at col. 3, lines 39-48 (describing block 200 of FIG. 2). Wallack's system iteratively calculates the display width of the cell for a sample record, compares the current sample record's cell width to the stored width, the current width is stored to identify the longest width. See Wallack at col. 4, lines 15-34 (describing blocks 230-260 of FIG. 2). Wallack's system, after comparing all sample records, resets the width of the column specified by a user to the stored width. See Wallack at col. 4, lines 31-37. Wallack's system also enables a user to specify a minimum column width for the selected column being resized. See Wallack at col. 3, line 54-55 (describing block 220 of FIG. 2) and col. 4, lines 22-25. Hence, Wallack discloses resizing a field on a computer generated form based on a sample of records or a minimum size for a field.

Accordingly, Wallack does not disclose adjusting the size of the user input area based on a size of characters included in the data field *and the specified number of characters of the data field*, much less doing so where the size of characters included in the data field includes a size of the input character, as recited in claims 1 and 13.

Glaser discloses techniques for a graphical user interface control for expansion and re-sizing of data fields in electronic forms. See Glaser at col. 2, lines 9-25 (summary). More particularly, Glaser discloses:

A computer interface system employing a menu-graphical graphical user interface for the entry of text data in a data store receives user inputs for controlling the graphical user interface, which interface provides a document form

display including at least one data entry field for text entry. The system is invested with the ability to generate a pointer in the display which is positionable in response to a control input from a user. The system is responsive to a selected positioning of the pointer and to a further control input from the user for varying the size of the data field.

Glaser at Abstract. As such, Glaser discloses a user-driven process for controlling a graphical user interface.

As noted above, the final action and the advisory action acknowledge that Inaki does not disclose visual indication of adjusting the size of the field based on the size of characters included in the data field.

Accordingly, neither Inaki, Glaser, Wallack nor any proper combination of the references, describes or suggests adjusting the size of the user input area based on a size of characters included in the data field and the specified number of characters of the data field, where the size of characters included in the data field includes a size of the input character, as recited by claims 1 and 13.¹

Further, because the references, alone or in combination, do not describe or suggest adjusting the size of the user input area based on a size of characters included in the data field and the specified number of characters of the data field, where the size of characters included in the data field includes a size of the input character, neither Inaki, Glaser, Wallack nor any proper combination of the references, describes or suggests displaying the adjusted user input area having a new size that visually indicates to the user that the user input area will accommodate therein visual representations of a remaining number of the specified number of characters of the data field, also as recited in claims 1 and 13.

Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdraw of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 13 and their respective dependent claims 2-12 and 14-20.

¹ This argument was presented in the response to the final action. For at least this reason, applicant disagrees with the advisory action's contention that applicant "mainly argues that there is no proper combination."

Applicant : Udo Klein et al
Serial No. : 10/675,208
Filed : September 30, 2003
Page : 5 of 5

Attorney's Docket No.: 16104-005001 / 2003P00582 US

Conclusion and Relief

Therefore, for at least the reasons described above and the reasons presented in applicant's prior replies, the rejections of record are clearly improper and without basis. In view of the above, all of the claims are in condition for allowance. A formal notice of allowance is thus respectfully requested.

This request is filed with a Notice of Appeal. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 2, 2007

Barbara A Benoit
Barbara A. Benoit
Reg. No. 54,777

Customer No.: 32864
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331